

Identifying Quantum Structures in the Ellsberg Paradox

Diederik Aerts¹, Sandro Sozzo¹ and Jocelyn Tapia²

¹ *Center Leo Apostel for Interdisciplinary Studies
and, Department of Mathematics, Brussels Free University
Krijgskundestraat 33, 1160 Brussels, Belgium
E-Mails: diraerts@vub.ac.be, ssozzo@vub.ac.be*

² *Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile
Avda. Libertador Bernardo OHiggins 340, Santiago (Chile)
E-Mails: jntapia@uc.cl*

Abstract

Empirical evidence has confirmed that quantum effects systematically occur also outside the microscopic domain, while quantum structures satisfactorily model various situations in several areas of science, including biological, cognitive and social processes. In this paper, we elaborate a quantum mechanical model which faithfully describes the *Ellsberg paradox* in economics, showing that the mathematical formalism of quantum mechanics is capable to represent the *ambiguity* present in this kind of situations, because of their *contextuality*. Then, we analyze the data collected in a concrete experiment we performed on the Ellsberg paradox and work out a complete representation of them in complex Hilbert space, indicating that genuine quantum effects occur in the decision processes of the participants in the experiment. Our approach sheds light on ‘ambiguity laden’ decision processes in economics and decision theory, and allows to deal with different Ellsberg-type generalizations, e.g., the *Machina paradox*.

Keywords: Ellsberg paradox, Ambiguity, Quantum structures, Incompatibility

1 Introduction

Common approaches in economics follow the hypothesis that agents’ behavior during a decision process is mainly ruled by *expected utility theory* (EUT) [1, 2]. Roughly speaking, in presence of uncertainty events, decision makers choose in such a way that they maximize their utility. Notwithstanding its mathematical tractability and predictive success, the structural validity of EUT at the individual level is questionable. Indeed, systematic empirical deviations from the predictions of EUT have been observed which are usually referred to as *paradoxes* [3, 4].

EUT was formally developed by von Neumann and Morgenstern [1]. They presented a set of axioms that allow to represent decision-maker preferences over the set of *acts* (functions from the set of states of the world into the set of consequences) by a suitable functional $E_p u(\cdot)$, for some Bernoulli utility function u on the set of consequences and an objective probability measure p on the set of states of the nature. An important aspect of EUT concerns the treatment of uncertainty. Knight had pointed out the difference between *risk* and *uncertainty* reserving the term *risk* for situations that can be described by known (or physical) probabilities, and the term *uncertainty* to refer to situations in which agents do not know the probabilities associated with each of the possible outcomes of an act [5]. Von Neumann and Morgenstern

Act	red	yellow	black
f_1	12\$	0\$	0\$
f_2	0\$	0\$	12\$
f_3	12\$	12\$	0\$
f_4	0\$	12\$	12\$

Table 1: The payoff matrix for the Ellsberg paradox situation.

modeling did not contemplate the latter possibility, since all probabilities are *objectively* or, physically, given in their scheme. For this reason, Savage extended EUT allowing agents to construct their own subjective probabilities when physical probabilities are not available [2]. According to Savage’s model, the distinction proposed by Knight seems however irrelevant. Ellsberg instead showed that Knightian’s distinction is empirically meaningful [3]. In particular, he presented the following experiment. Consider one urn with 30 red balls and 60 balls that are either yellow or black, the latter in unknown proportion. One ball will be drawn from the urn. Then, free of charge, a person is asked to bet on one of the acts f_1 , f_2 , f_3 and f_4 defined in Tab. 1. When asked to rank these gambles most of the persons choose to bet on f_1 over f_2 and f_4 over f_3 . This preference cannot be explained by EUT. Indeed, individuals’ ranking of the sub-acts [12 on *red*; 0 on *black*] versus [0 on *red*; 12 on *black*] depends upon whether the event *yellow* yields a payoff of 0 or 12, contrary to what is suggested by the Sure-Thing principle, an important axiom of Savage’s model. Nevertheless, these choices have a direct intuition: f_1 offers the 12 prize with an *objective probability* of $1/3$, and f_2 offers the same prize but in an element of the *subjective partition* $\{\textit{black}, \textit{yellow}\}$. In the same way, f_4 offers the prize with an objective probability of $2/3$, whereas f_3 offers the same payoff on the union of the unambiguous event *red* and the ambiguous event *yellow*. Thus, in both cases the unambiguous bet is preferred to its ambiguous counterpart, a phenomenon called *ambiguity aversion* by Ellsberg.

Many extensions of EUT have been worked out to cope with Ellsberg-type preferences, which mainly consist in replacing the Sure-Thing Principle by weaker axioms. We briefly summarize the most known, as follows.

(i) *Choquet expected utility* (or, expected utility with *non-additive* probabilities). This model considers a subjective non-additive probability (or, capacity) over the states of nature rather than a subjective probability. Thus, decision-makers could underestimate or overestimate probabilities in the Ellsberg experiment, and ambiguity aversion is equivalent to the convexity of the capacity (pessimistic beliefs) [6].

(ii) *Max-Min expected utility* (or, expected utility with multi-prior). The lack of knowledge about the states of nature of the decision-maker cannot be represented by a unique probability measure but, rather, by a set of probability measures. Then, an act f is preferred to g iff $\min_{p \in P} E_p u(f) > \min_{p \in P} E_p u(g)$, where P is a convex and closed set of additive probability measures. Ambiguity aversion is represented by the pessimistic beliefs of the agent which takes decisions considering the worst probabilistic scenario [7].

(iii) *Variational preferences*. In this dynamic generalization of the Max-Min expected utility, agents rank acts according to the criterion $\inf_{p \in \Delta} \{E_p u(f) + c(p)\}$, where $c(p)$ is a closed and convex penalty function associated with the probability election [8].

(iv) *Second order probabilities*. This is a model of preferences over acts where the decision-maker prefers act f to act g iff $E_\mu \phi(E_p u(f)) > E_\mu \phi(E_p u(g))$, where E is the expectation operator, u is a von Neumann-Morgenstern utility function, ϕ is an increasing transformation, and μ is a subjective probability over the set of probability measures p that the decision-maker thinks are feasible. Ambiguity aversion is here represented by the concavity of the transformation ϕ [9].

Despite approaches (i)–(iv) have been widely used in economic and financial modeling, none of them is immune of critics [4, 10]. And, worse, none of these models can satisfactorily represent more general

Ellsberg-type situations (e.g., the *Machina paradox* [4, 11]). As a consequence, the construction of a unified perspective representing ambiguity is still an unachieved goal in economics and decision making.

We have recently inquired both conceptually and structurally into the above approaches generalizing EUT [6, 7, 8, 9] to cope with ambiguity. The latter is defined as a situation without a probability model describing it as opposed to *risk*, where a classical probability model on a σ -algebra of events is presupposed. The generalizations in (i)–(iv) consider more general structures than a single classical probability model on a σ -algebra. We are convinced that this is the point: ambiguity, due to its contextuality, structurally need a non-classical probability model. To this end we have elaborated a general framework, based on the notion of *contextual risk* and inspired by the probability structure of quantum mechanics, which is intrinsically different from a classical probability on a σ -algebra, the set of events is indeed *not* a Boolean algebra [12, 13, 14, 15]. Inspired by this approach, we work out in the present article a complete mathematical representation of the Ellsberg paradox situation (states, payoffs, bets, preferences) in the standard mathematical formalism of quantum mechanics, hence by using a complex Hilbert space, and representing the probability measures by means of projection valued measures on this complex Hilbert space [16] (Sect. 2). This analysis leads us to claim that the structure of the probability models is essentially different from the ones of known approaches – projection valued measures instead of σ -algebra valued measures. But, more important, also the way in which states are represented in quantum mechanics, i.e. by unit vectors of the Hilbert space, introduces an essential different aspect, coping both mathematically and intuitively with the notion of ambiguity as introduced in economics. Successively, we analyze the experimental data we collected in a *statistically meaningful* experiment we performed, where real decision-makers were asked to bet on the different acts defined by the Ellsberg paradox situation [12, 13] (Sect. 3). We prove that our quantum mechanical model faithfully represents the subjects' preferences together with experimental statistics. Furthermore, we describe the choices between acts f_1/f_2 and between acts f_3/f_4 by quantum observables represented by spectral families, showing that the latter are incompatible in the standard quantum sense (Sect. 4). This means that the conceptual landscape surrounding the agents' choice between f_1 and f_2 is not compatible with the conceptual landscape surrounding the agents' choice between f_3 and f_4 , which is our quantum modeling explanation to the presence of ambiguity aversion. These results strongly suggest that, more generally, 'ambiguity laden' situations can be explained in terms of the appearance of typically quantum effects, namely, contextuality, superposition and incompatibility, and that quantum structures have the capacity to mathematically deal with this type of situations. Hence, our findings naturally fit within the growing 'quantum interaction research' which mainly applies quantum structures to cognitive situations [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27].

2 A quantum model in Hilbert space for the Ellsberg paradox

We have recently worked out a Hilbert space model for the Ellsberg paradox situation [16]. Here we present an improved and more general version of it, also showing further results that can be attained. To this end let us consider the situation illustrated in Tab. 1, Sect. 1. The simplest Hilbert space that can supply a faithful modeling of the Ellsberg situation is the three dimensional complex Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^3$ whose canonical basis we denote by $\{|1, 0, 0\rangle, |0, 1, 0\rangle, |0, 0, 1\rangle\}$. We introduce the model in different steps: we will see that in each of them, quantum structures enable a new and satisfying way to model an aspect of the ambiguity. At the last step it will be made clear that modeling the agents' decisions at a statistical level requires the full probabilistic apparatus of quantum mechanics, that is, both states and measurements.

2.1 The conceptual Ellsberg entity

First we define the part of the model, which we call the *conceptual Ellsberg entity*, since it consists of the Ellsberg situation without considering neither the different acts nor the person nor the bet to be taken. Hence it is the situation of the urn with 30 red balls and 60 black and yellow balls in unknown proportion. Already at this stage, the presence of ambiguity can be mathematically taken into account by means of the quantum mechanical formalism. To this aim we introduce a quantum mechanical context e and represent it by means of the family $\{P_r, P_{yb}\}$, where P_r is the one dimensional orthogonal projection operator on the subspace generated by the unit vector $|1, 0, 0\rangle$, and P_{yb} is the two dimensional orthogonal projection operator on the subspace generated by the unit vectors $|0, 1, 0\rangle$ and $|0, 0, 1\rangle$. $\{P_r, P_{yb}\}$ is a spectral family, since $P_r \perp P_{yb}$ and $P_r + P_{yb} = 1$. Contexts, more specifically measurement contexts, are represented by spectral families of orthogonal projection operators (equivalently, by a self-adjoint operator determined by such a family) also in quantum mechanics. Again in analogy with quantum mechanics, we represent the states of the conceptual Ellsberg entity by means of unit vectors of $\mathbb{C}^3$. For example, the unit vector

$$|v_{ry}\rangle = \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}e^{i\theta_r}, \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}e^{i\theta_y}, 0 \right\rangle \quad (1)$$

can be used to represent a state describing the Ellsberg situation. Indeed, the probability for ‘red’ in the state $p_{v_{ry}}$ represented by $|v_{ry}\rangle$ is

$$|\langle 1, 0, 0 | v_{ry} \rangle|^2 = \langle v_{ry} | 1, 0, 0 \rangle \langle 1, 0, 0 | v_{ry} \rangle = \| P_r | v_{ry} \rangle \|^2 = \frac{1}{3} \quad (2)$$

Moreover, the probability for ‘yellow or black’ in the state $p_{v_{ry}}$ represented by $|v_{ry}\rangle$ is

$$\| P_{yb} | v_{ry} \rangle \|^2 = \langle 0, \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}e^{i\theta_y}, 0 | 0, \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}e^{i\theta_y}, 0 \rangle = \frac{2}{3} \quad (3)$$

But this is not the only state describing the Ellsberg situation. For example, the unit vector

$$|v_{rb}\rangle = \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}e^{i\phi_r}, 0, \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}e^{i\theta_b} \right\rangle \quad (4)$$

also represents a state describing the Ellsberg situation. We thus denote the set of all states describing the Ellsberg situation (*Ellsberg state set*) by

$$\Sigma_{Ells} = \{p_v : |v\rangle = \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}e^{i\theta_r}, \rho_y e^{i\theta_y}, \rho_b e^{i\theta_b} \right\rangle \mid 0 \leq \rho_y, \rho_b, \rho_y^2 + \rho_b^2 = \frac{2}{3}\} \quad (5)$$

which is associated with a subset (not necessarily a linear subspace) of $\mathbb{C}^3$. If a state belongs to Σ_{Ells} , this state delivers a quantum description of the Ellsberg situation, together with the context e represented by the spectral family $\{P_r, P_{yb}\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^3$.

2.2 Modeling acts and utility

In the second step of our construction, we describe the different acts f_1, f_2, f_3 and f_4 . Here a second measurement context g is introduced. The context g describes the ball taken out of the urn and its color verified, red, yellow or black. Also g is represented by a spectral family of orthogonal projection operators $\{P_r, P_y, P_b\}$, where P_r is already defined, while P_y is the orthogonal projection operator on $|0, 1, 0\rangle$ and P_b is the orthogonal projection operator on $|0, 0, 1\rangle$. Thus, the probabilities $\mu_r(g, p_v)$, $\mu_y(g, p_v)$ and $\mu_b(g, p_v)$

of drawing a red ball, a yellow ball and a black ball, respectively, in a state p_v represented by the unit vector $|v\rangle = |\rho_r e^{i\theta_r}, \rho_y e^{i\theta_y}, \rho_b e^{i\theta_b}\rangle$ are

$$\mu_r(g, p_v) = \|P_r|v\rangle\|^2 = \langle v|P_r|v\rangle = \rho_r^2 \quad (6)$$

$$\mu_y(g, p_v) = \|P_y|v\rangle\|^2 = \langle v|P_y|v\rangle = \rho_y^2 \quad (7)$$

$$\mu_b(g, p_v) = \|P_b|v\rangle\|^2 = \langle v|P_b|v\rangle = \rho_b^2 \quad (8)$$

The acts f_1 , f_2 , f_3 and f_4 are observables in our modeling, hence they are represented by self-adjoint operators, built on the spectral decomposition $\{P_r, P_y, P_b\}$. More specifically, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = 12\$P_r \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = 12\$P_b \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_3 = 12\$P_r + 12\$P_y \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_4 = 12\$P_y + 12\$P_b = 12\$P_{yb} \quad (12)$$

Let us now analyze the expected payoffs and the utility connected with the different acts. For the sake of simplicity, we identify here the utility with the expected payoff, which implies that we are considering *risk neutral agents*. Consider an arbitrary state $p_v \in \Sigma_{Ells}$ and the acts f_1 and f_4 . We have

$$U(f_1, g, p_v) = \langle p_v|\mathcal{F}_1|p_v\rangle = 12\$ \cdot \frac{1}{3} = 4\$ \quad (13)$$

$$U(f_4, g, p_v) = \langle p_v|\mathcal{F}_4|p_v\rangle = 12\$ \cdot \frac{2}{3} = 8\$ \quad (14)$$

which shows that both these utilities are completely *independent* of the considered state of Σ_{Ells} , i.e. they are *ambiguity free*. Consider now the acts f_2 and f_3 , and again an arbitrary state $p_v \in \Sigma_{Ells}$. We have

$$U(f_2, g, p_v) = \langle p_v|\mathcal{F}_2|p_v\rangle = 12\$\mu_b(g, p_v) \quad (15)$$

$$U(f_3, g, p_v) = \langle p_v|\mathcal{F}_3|p_v\rangle = 12\$(\mu_r(g, p_v) + \mu_y(g, p_v)) \quad (16)$$

which shows that both utilities strongly depend on the state p_v , due to the ambiguity the two acts are confronted with. This can be significantly revealed by considering two extreme cases. Let $p_{v_{ry}}$ and $p_{v_{rb}}$ be the states represented by the vectors $|v_{ry}\rangle$ and $|v_{rb}\rangle$ in Eqs. (1) and (4), respectively. These states give rise for the act f_2 to utilities

$$U(f_2, g, p_{v_{ry}}) = 12\$\mu_b(g, p_{v_{ry}}) = 12\$ \cdot 0 = 0\$ \quad (17)$$

$$U(f_2, g, p_{v_{rb}}) = 12\$\mu_b(g, p_{v_{rb}}) = 12\$ \cdot \frac{2}{3} = 8\$ \quad (18)$$

This shows that a state $p_{v_{rb}}$ exists within the realm of ambiguity, where the utility of act f_2 is greater than the utility of act f_1 , and also a state $p_{v_{ry}}$ exists within the realm of ambiguity, where the utility of act f_2 is smaller than the utility of act f_1 . If we look at act f_3 , we find for the two considered extreme states the following utilities

$$U(f_3, g, p_{v_{ry}}) = 12\$(\mu_r(g, p_{v_{ry}}) + \mu_y(g, p_{v_{ry}})) = 12\$(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3}) = 12\$ \quad (19)$$

$$U(f_3, g, p_{v_{rb}}) = 12\$(\mu_r(g, p_{v_{rb}}) + \mu_y(g, p_{v_{rb}})) = 12\$(\frac{1}{3} + 0) = 4\$ \quad (20)$$

Analogously, namely the state $p_{v_{ry}}$ gives rise to a greater utility, while the state $p_{v_{rb}}$ gives rise to a smaller utility than the independent one obtained in act f_4 .

2.3 Decision making and superposition states

The third step of our modeling consists in taking directly into account the role played by ambiguity. We proceed as follows [20].

We suppose that the two extreme states $p_{v_{ry}}$ and $p_{v_{rb}}$ in Sect. 2.1 are relevant in the mind of the person that is asked to bet. Hence, it is a superposition state of these two states that will guide the decision process during the bet. Let us construct a general superposition state p_{v_s} of these two states. Hence the vector $|v_s\rangle$ representing p_{v_s} can be written as

$$|v_s\rangle = ae^{i\alpha}|v_{rb}\rangle + be^{i\beta}|v_{ry}\rangle \quad (21)$$

where a , b , α and β are chosen in such a way that $\langle v_s|v_s\rangle = 1$, which means that

$$1 = a^2 + b^2 + \frac{2ab}{3} \cos(\beta - \alpha + \theta_r - \phi_r) \quad (22)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\cos(\beta - \alpha + \theta_r - \phi_r) = \frac{3(1 - a^2 - b^2)}{2ab} \quad (23)$$

The amplitude of the state p_{v_s} with the first basis vector $|1, 0, 0\rangle$ is given by

$$\langle 1, 0, 0|v_s\rangle = \frac{a}{\sqrt{3}}e^{i(\alpha+\phi_r)} + \frac{b}{\sqrt{3}}e^{i(\beta+\theta_r)} \quad (24)$$

Therefore, the transition probability is

$$|\langle 1, 0, 0|v_s\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{3}(a^2 + b^2 + 3 - 3a^2 - 3b^2) = \frac{1}{3}(3 - 2a^2 - 2b^2) = \mu_r(g, p_{v_s}) \quad (25)$$

as one can easily verify. Analogously, the amplitudes with the second and third basis vectors are given by

$$\langle 0, 1, 0|v_s\rangle = ae^{i\alpha}\langle 0, 1, 0|v_{rb}\rangle + be^{i\beta}\langle 0, 1, 0|v_{ry}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}be^{i(\beta+\theta_y)} \quad (26)$$

$$\langle 0, 0, 1|v_s\rangle = ae^{i\alpha}\langle 0, 0, 1|v_{rb}\rangle + be^{i\beta}\langle 0, 0, 1|v_{ry}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}ae^{i(\alpha+\theta_b)} \quad (27)$$

respectively. Therefore, the transition probabilities are

$$|\langle 0, 1, 0|v_s\rangle|^2 = \frac{2}{3}b^2 = \mu_y(g, p_{v_s}) \quad (28)$$

$$|\langle 0, 0, 1|v_s\rangle|^2 = \frac{2}{3}a^2 = \mu_b(g, p_{v_s}) \quad (29)$$

From the foregoing follows that a general superposition state is represented by the unit vector

$$|v_s\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}[ae^{i(\alpha+\phi_r)} + be^{i(\beta+\theta_r)}, \sqrt{2}be^{i(\beta+\theta_y)}, \sqrt{2}ae^{i(\alpha+\theta_b)}] \quad (30)$$

and that the utilities corresponding to the different acts are given by

$$U(f_1, g, p_{v_s}) = \langle v_s|\mathcal{F}_1|v_s\rangle = 4\$(3 - 2a^2 - 2b^2) \quad (31)$$

$$U(f_2, g, p_{v_s}) = \langle v_s|\mathcal{F}_2|v_s\rangle = 4\$ \cdot 2a^2 \quad (32)$$

$$U(f_3, g, p_{v_s}) = \langle v_s|\mathcal{F}_3|v_s\rangle = 4\$ \cdot (3 - 2a^2) \quad (33)$$

$$U(f_4, g, p_{v_s}) = \langle v_s|\mathcal{F}_4|v_s\rangle = 4\$(2a^2 + 2b^2) \quad (34)$$

We can see that it is not necessarily the case that $\mu_r(g, p_{v_s}) = \frac{1}{3}$, which means that choices of a and b can be made such that the superposition state $p_{v_s} \notin \Sigma_{Ells}$. The reason is that Σ_{Ells} is not a linearly closed subset of $\mathbb{C}^3$.

Let us then consider some of the extreme possibilities of superpositions. For example, choose $a = b = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$. Then we have $\mu_y(g, p_{v_s}) = \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{3}{4} = \frac{1}{2}$, $\mu_b(g, p_{v_s}) = \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{3}{4} = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\mu_r(g, p_{v_s}) = 0$, and $\cos(\beta - \alpha + \theta_r - \phi_r) = \frac{3(1-a^2-b^2)}{2ab} = -1$, hence $\beta = \pi + \alpha - \theta_r + \phi_r$. Thus, the state represented by

$$|v_s(yb)\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(e^{i\alpha}|v_{rb}\rangle + e^{i(\pi+\alpha-\theta_r+\phi_r)}|v_{ry}\rangle) \quad (35)$$

gives rise to probability zero for a red ball to be drawn. Another extreme choice is, when we take $a = b = \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}$. Then we have $\mu_y(g, p_{v_s}) = \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{3}{8} = \frac{1}{4}$, $\mu_b(g, p_{v_s}) = \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{3}{8} = \frac{1}{4}$ and $\mu_r(g, p_{v_s}) = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\cos(\beta - \alpha + \theta_r - \phi_r) = +1$, which means $\beta = \alpha - \theta_r + \phi_r$. Hence, the state

$$|v_s(r)\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}(e^{i\alpha}|v_{rb}\rangle + e^{i(\alpha-\theta_r+\phi_r)}|v_{ry}\rangle) \quad (36)$$

gives rise to probability $\frac{1}{2}$ for a red ball to be drawn. These are extreme superposition states which are not compatible with the situation as formulated by Ellsberg, but they could be useful if suitable Ellsberg-type extensions are taken into account.

To construct non-trivial superpositions that retain probability $\frac{1}{3}$ for drawing a red ball, we require that

$$\frac{1}{3} = \mu_r(g, p_{v_s}) = \frac{1}{3}(3 - 2a^2 - 2b^2) \quad (37)$$

or, equivalently,

$$a^2 + b^2 = 1 \quad (38)$$

which implies that $\cos(\beta - \alpha + \theta_r - \phi_r) = 0$, hence $\beta = \frac{\pi}{2} + \alpha - \theta_r + \phi_r$.

Let us construct now two examples of superposition states that conserve the $\frac{1}{3}$ probability for drawing a red ball, and hence are conservative superpositions, and express ambiguity as is thought to be the case in the Ellsberg paradox situation. The first state refers to the comparison for a bet between f_1 and f_2 . The ambiguity of not knowing the number of yellow and black balls in the urn, only their sum to be 60, as compared to knowing the number of red balls in the urn to be 30, gives rise to the thought that ‘eventually there are perhaps almost no black balls and hence an abundance of yellow balls’. Jointly, and in superposition, the thought also comes that ‘it is of course also possible that there are more black balls than yellow balls’. These two thoughts in superposition, are mathematically represented by a state p_{v_s} . The state p_{v_s} will be closer to $p_{v_{ry}}$, the extreme state with no black balls, if the person is deeply ambiguity averse, while it will be closer to $p_{v_{rb}}$, the extreme state with no yellow balls, if the person is attracted by ambiguity. Hence, these two tendencies are expressed by the values of a and b in the superposition state. If we consider again the utilities, this time with $a^2 + b^2 = 1$, we have

$$U(f_1, g, p_{v_s}) = 4\$ \quad (39)$$

$$U(f_2, g, p_{v_s}) = 4\$ \cdot 2a^2 \quad (40)$$

$$U(f_3, g, p_{v_s}) = 4\$ \cdot (3 - 2a^2) \quad (41)$$

$$U(f_4, g, p_{v_s}) = 8\$ \quad (42)$$

So, for $a^2 < \frac{1}{2}$, which exactly means that the superposition state p_{v_s} is closer to the state $p_{v_{ry}}$ than to the state $p_{v_{rb}}$, we have that $U(f_2, g, p_{v_s}) < U(f_1, g, p_{v_s})$, and hence a person with strong ambiguity aversion in

the situation of the first bet, will then prefer to bet on f_1 and not on f_2 . Let us choose a concrete state for the bet between f_1 and f_2 , and call it $p_{v_s^{12}}$, and denote its superposition state by $|v_s^{12}\rangle$. Hence, for $|v_s^{12}\rangle$ we take $a = \frac{1}{2}$ and $b = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ and hence $a^2 = \frac{1}{4}$ and $b^2 = \frac{3}{4}$. For the angles we must have $\beta - \alpha + \theta_r - \phi_r = \frac{\pi}{2}$, hence let us choose $\theta_r = \phi_r = 0$, $\alpha = 0$, and $\beta = \frac{\pi}{2}$. This gives us

$$|v_s^{12}\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}|1 + \sqrt{3}e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}}, \sqrt{2}\sqrt{3}e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}}, \sqrt{2}\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}|1 + i\sqrt{3}, i\sqrt{6}, \sqrt{2}\rangle \quad (43)$$

On the other hand, for $\frac{1}{2} < a^2$, which means that the superposition state is closer to the state $p_{v_{rb}}$ than to the state $p_{v_{ry}}$, we have that $U(f_3, g, p_{v_s}) < U(f_4, g, p_{v_s})$, and hence a person with strong ambiguity aversion in the situation of the second bet, will then prefer to bet on f_4 and not on f_3 . Also for this case we construct an explicit state, let us call it $p_{v_s^{34}}$, and denote it by the vector $|v_s^{34}\rangle$. Hence, for $|v_s^{34}\rangle$ we take $a = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ and $b = \frac{1}{2}$ and hence $a^2 = \frac{3}{4}$ and $b^2 = \frac{1}{4}$. For the angles we must have $\beta - \alpha + \theta_r - \phi_r = \frac{\pi}{2}$, hence let us choose $\theta_r = \phi_r = 0$, $\alpha = 0$, and $\beta = \frac{\pi}{2}$. This gives us

$$|v_s^{34}\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}|\sqrt{3} + e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}}, \sqrt{2}e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}}, \sqrt{2}\sqrt{3}\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}|\sqrt{3} + i, i\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{6}\rangle \quad (44)$$

The superposition states $p_{v_s^{12}}$ and $p_{v_s^{34}}$ representing the unit vectors $|v_s^{12}\rangle$ and $|v_s^{34}\rangle$, respectively, will be used in the next sections to provide a faithful modeling of a concrete experiment in which decisions are expressed by real agents.

3 An experiment testing the Ellsberg paradox

We have observed in the previous sections that genuine quantum aspects intervene in the description of the Ellsberg paradox. This will be even more evident from the analysis of a *statistically relevant* experiment we performed of this paradox, whose results were firstly reported in [13]. To perform the experiment we sent out the following text to several people, consisting of a mixture of friends, relatives and students, to avoid as much as possible a statistical bias.

We are conducting a small-scale statistics investigation into a particular problem and would like to invite you to participate as test subjects. Please note that it is not the aim for this problem to be resolved in terms of correct or incorrect answers. It is your preference for a particular choice we want to test. The question concerns the following situation. Imagine an urn containing 90 balls of three different colors: red balls, black balls and yellow balls. We know that the number of red balls is 30 and that the sum of the the black balls and the yellow balls is 60. The questions of our investigation are about the situation where somebody randomly takes one ball from the urn.

(i) *The first question is about a choice to be made between two bets: bet f_1 and bet f_2 . Bet f_1 involves winning ‘10 euros when the ball is red’ and ‘zero euros when it is black or yellow’. Bet f_2 involves winning ‘10 euros when the ball is black’ and ‘zero euros when it is red or yellow’. The rst question we would ask you to answer is: Which of the two bets, bet f_1 or bet f_2 , would you prefer?*

(ii) *The second question is again about a choice between two different bets, bet f_3 and bet f_4 . Bet f_3 involves winning ‘10 euros when the ball is red or yellow’ and ‘zero euros when the ball is black’. Bet f_4 involves winning ‘10 euros when the ball is black or yellow’ and ‘zero euros when the ball is red’. The second question therefore is: Which of the two bets, bet f_3 or bet f_4 , would you prefer?*

Please provide in your reply message the following information.

For question 1, your preference (your choice between bet f_1 and bet f_2). For question 2, your preference (your choice between bet f_3 and bet f_4). By ‘preference’ we mean ‘the bet you would take if this situation happened to you in real life’. You are expected to choose one of the bets for each of the questions, i.e. ‘not

choosing is no option'. You are welcome to provide a brief explanation of your preferences, which may be of a purely intuitive nature, only mentioning feelings, for example, but this is not required. It is all right if you only state your preferences without giving any explanation.

One final remark about the colors. Your choices should not be affected by any personal color preference. If you feel that the colors of the example somehow have an influence on your choices, you should restate the problem and take colors that are indifferent to yours, if this does not work, other neutral characteristics to distinguish the balls.

Let us now analyze the obtained results.

We had 59 respondents participating in our test of the Ellsberg paradox problem, which is the typical number of participants in experiments on psychological effect of the type studied by Khaneman and Tversky, such as the conjunction fallacy, and the disjunction effect. (see, e.g., [28, 29]). We do believe that ambiguity aversion is a psychological effect within this calls of effects, which means that in case our hypothesis on the nature of ambiguity aversion is correct, our test is significant. This being said, it would certainly be interesting to make a similar test with a larger number of participants, which is something we plan for the future. We however also remark that the quantum modeling scheme is general enough to also model statistical data that are different from the ones collected in this specific test. Next to this remark, we want to point out that in the present paper we want to prove that these real data ‘can’ be modeled in our approach.

The answers of the participants were distributed as follows: (a) 34 subjects preferred bets f_1 and f_4 ; (b) 12 subjects preferred bets f_2 and f_3 ; (c) 7 subjects preferred bets f_2 and f_4 ; (d) 6 subjects preferred bets f_1 and f_3 . This makes the weights with preference of bet f_1 over bet f_2 to be 0.68 against 0.32, and the weights with preference of bet f_4 over bet f_3 to be 0.69 against 0.31. It is worth to note that $34+12=46$ people chose the combination of bet f_1 and bet f_4 or bet f_2 and bet f_3 , which is 87. In Sect. 4 we apply our quantum mechanical model to these experimental data.

4 Quantum modeling the experiment and incompatibility

As anticipated in Sect. 2.3, we take into account the superposition states $p_{v_s}^{12}$ and $p_{v_s}^{34}$ to put forward a description of the choices made by the participants in the test described in Sect. 3. We employ in this section the spectral methods that are typically used in quantum mechanics to construct self-adjoint operators.

First we consider the choice to bet on f_1 or on f_2 . This is a choice with two possible outcomes, let us call them o_1 and o_2 . Thus, we introduce two projection operators P_1 and P_2 on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^3$, and represent the observable associated with the first bet by the self-adjoint operator (spectral decomposition) $\mathcal{O}_{12} = o_1 P_1 + o_2 P_2$. Then, we consider the choice to bet on f_3 or on f_4 . This is a choice with two possible outcomes too, let us call them o_3 and o_4 . Thus, we introduce two projection operators P_3 and P_4 on $\mathbb{C}^3$, and represent the observable associated with the second bet by the self-adjoint operator (spectral decomposition) $\mathcal{O}_{34} = o_3 P_3 + o_4 P_4$.

To model the empirical data in Sect. 3, we recall that we tested in our experiment 59 participants, and 40 preferred f_1 over f_2 , while the remaining 19 chose for f_2 instead of f_1 . This means that we should construct P_1 and P_2 in such a way that

$$\langle v_s^{12} | P_1 | v_s^{12} \rangle = \frac{40}{59} = 0.68 \quad \langle v_s^{12} | P_2 | v_s^{12} \rangle = \frac{19}{59} = 0.32 \quad (45)$$

We also need to construct two orthogonal projection operators P_3 and P_4 , such that model the second bet to be taken, the one choosing between f_3 and f_4 . In our experiment of the 59 participants there were 41

preferring f_4 over f_3 , and 18 who choose the other way around. Hence, we should have

$$\langle v_s^{34} | P_3 | v_s^{34} \rangle = \frac{18}{59} = 0.31 \quad \langle v_s^{34} | P_4 | v_s^{34} \rangle = \frac{41}{59} = 0.69 \quad (46)$$

Both bets should give rise to no preference, hence probabilities $\frac{1}{2}$ in all cases, when there is no ambiguity, when the state is p_{v_c} represented by the vector

$$|v_c\rangle = \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right\rangle \quad (47)$$

We can now show that the observables represented by the self-adjoint operators $\mathcal{O}_{12}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{34}$ cannot be compatible in the standard quantum sense, that is, $\mathcal{O}_{12}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{34}$ do not commute in our experiment. To this end, let us preliminarily denote by $\mathcal{S}_1^{12}$, $\mathcal{S}_2^{12}$, $\mathcal{S}_3^{34}$ and $\mathcal{S}_4^{34}$ the eigenspaces associated with the eigenvalues o_1 , o_2 , o_3 and o_4 , respectively. We can assume that $\mathcal{S}_2^{12}$ and $\mathcal{S}_4^{34}$ are one dimensional, and $\mathcal{S}_1^{12}$ and $\mathcal{S}_3^{34}$ are two dimensional, without loss of generality. Then, we prove the following two theorems.

Theorem 1. *If, under the hypothesis on the eigenspaces formulated above, the two self-adjoint operators (spectral decompositions) $\mathcal{O}_{12} = o_1 P_1 + o_2 P_2$ and $\mathcal{O}_{34} = o_3 P_3 + o_4 P_4$ are such that $[\mathcal{O}_{12}, \mathcal{O}_{34}] = 0$ in $\mathbb{C}^3$, then an orthonormal basis $\{|e_1\rangle, |e_2\rangle, |e_3\rangle\}$ of common eigenvectors exists such that $P_1 = |e_1\rangle\langle e_1| + |e_2\rangle\langle e_2|$, $P_2 = |e_3\rangle\langle e_3|$, $P_3 = |e_2\rangle\langle e_2| + |e_3\rangle\langle e_3|$ and $P_4 = |e_1\rangle\langle e_1|$.*

Proof. We choose $|e_1\rangle$ and $|e_3\rangle$ unit vectors in $\mathcal{S}_2^{12}$ and $\mathcal{S}_4^{34}$. Since $[\mathcal{O}_{12}, \mathcal{O}_{34}] = 0$ it follows that $|e_1\rangle \perp |e_3\rangle$. Since $\mathcal{S}_1^{12}$ and $\mathcal{S}_3^{34}$ are both two dimensional, their intersection is one dimensional, and hence we choose $|e_2\rangle$ a unit vector contained in this intersection. Since $[\mathcal{O}_{12}, \mathcal{O}_{34}] = 0$ it follows that $|e_2\rangle \perp |e_1\rangle$ and $|e_2\rangle \perp |e_3\rangle$. Hence $\{|e_1\rangle, |e_2\rangle, |e_3\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis, and $P_1 = |e_1\rangle\langle e_1| + |e_2\rangle\langle e_2|$, $P_2 = |e_3\rangle\langle e_3|$, $P_3 = |e_2\rangle\langle e_2| + |e_3\rangle\langle e_3|$ and $P_4 = |e_1\rangle\langle e_1|$. $\square$

Theorem 2. *There do not exist mutually commuting spectral families $\{P_1, P_2\}$ and $\{P_3, P_4\}$ defined as in Theorem 1 which also simultaneously satisfy the following equations*

$$\langle e_1 | e_1 \rangle = \langle e_2 | e_2 \rangle = \langle e_3 | e_3 \rangle = 1 \quad (48)$$

$$\langle e_1 | e_2 \rangle = \langle e_1 | e_3 \rangle = \langle e_2 | e_3 \rangle = 0 \quad (49)$$

$$|\langle v_s^{12} | e_1 \rangle|^2 + |\langle v_s^{12} | e_2 \rangle|^2 = 0.68 \quad (50)$$

$$|\langle v_s^{12} | e_3 \rangle|^2 = 0.32 \quad (51)$$

$$|\langle v_s^{34} | e_2 \rangle|^2 + |\langle v_s^{12} | e_3 \rangle|^2 = 0.31 \quad (52)$$

$$|\langle v_s^{34} | e_1 \rangle|^2 = 0.69 \quad (53)$$

$$|\langle v_c | e_1 \rangle|^2 + |\langle v_c | e_2 \rangle|^2 = 0.5 \quad (54)$$

$$|\langle v_c | e_3 \rangle|^2 = 0.5 \quad (55)$$

$$|\langle v_c | e_2 \rangle|^2 + |\langle v_c | e_3 \rangle|^2 = 0.5 \quad (56)$$

$$|\langle v_c | e_1 \rangle|^2 = 0.5 \quad (57)$$

Proof. Let us assume that Eqs. (48)–(57) are simultaneously satisfied. Then, from Eqs. (54)–(57) follows that $\langle v_c | e_2 \rangle = 0$, which entails that

$$|v_c\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\mu} |e_1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\nu} |e_3\rangle$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle v_s^{12} | v_c \rangle|^2 &= \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\mu} \langle v_s^{12} | e_1 \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\nu} \langle v_s^{12} | e_3 \rangle \right|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} |\langle v_s^{12} | e_1 \rangle|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\langle v_s^{12} | e_3 \rangle|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

On the other hand, by using Eqs. (43) and (47), we get

$$|\langle v_s^{12} | v_c \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{36} (12 + 8\sqrt{2}) \quad (59)$$

Hence, by inserting Eq. (59) into Eq. (58) and using Eq. (51), we have

$$|\langle v_s^{12} | e_1 \rangle|^2 \geq \frac{1}{18} (12 + 8\sqrt{2}) - 0.32 = 0.975$$

which is not compatible with Eq. (50). We thus get a contradiction. $\square$

Theorems 1 and 2 entail that the spectral families $\{P_1, P_2\}$ and $\{P_3, P_4\}$, hence the self-adjoint operators $\mathcal{O}_{12}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{34}$ do not commute. This means that within our quantum modeling approach the two bets cannot be represented by commuting observables if the statistical data of the real experiment are faithfully modeled. It also means that these bets cannot be, within our approach, represented within one Kolmogorovian probability. These finding of the impossibility for compatible observables representing the bets, is the strongest of our result indicating the necessity of a quantum modeling for the Ellsberg paradox situation.

We construct now an explicit incompatible solution. We consider again the spectral families $\{P_1, P_2\}$ and $\{P_3, P_4\}$, and assume that P_2 and P_4 are one dimensional projection operators, i.e. $P_2 = |X\rangle\langle X|$ and $P_4 = |Y\rangle\langle Y|$, with $|X\rangle = |x_1 e^{i\lambda_1}, y_1 e^{i\epsilon_1}, z_1 e^{i\delta_1}\rangle$ and $|Y\rangle = |x_2 e^{i\lambda_2}, y_2 e^{i\epsilon_2}, z_2 e^{i\delta_2}\rangle$. Thus, $P_1 = \mathbb{1} - P_2$ and $P_3 = \mathbb{1} - P_4$. The following set of equations should be simultaneously satisfied, in this case.

$$\langle X | X \rangle = \langle Y | Y \rangle = 1 \quad (60)$$

$$|\langle v_s^{12} | X \rangle|^2 = 0.32 \quad (61)$$

$$|\langle v_s^{34} | Y \rangle|^2 = 0.69 \quad (62)$$

$$|\langle v_c | X \rangle|^2 = 0.5 \quad (63)$$

$$|\langle v_c | Y \rangle|^2 = 0.5 \quad (64)$$

The following is a solution

$$x_1 = 0.02 \quad y_1 = 0.93 \quad z_1 = 0.45 \quad \lambda_1 = 28.90^\circ \quad \epsilon_1 = 4.24^\circ \quad \delta_1 = 52.80^\circ \quad (65)$$

$$x_2 = 0.25 \quad y_2 = 0.02 \quad z_2 = 0.97 \quad \lambda_2 = 17.40^\circ \quad \epsilon_2 = 31.25^\circ \quad \delta_2 = 37.29^\circ \quad (66)$$

We see at once that $|X\rangle$ and $|Y\rangle$ are not orthogonal, since $\langle X | Y \rangle \neq 0$. Then, the following orthogonal projection operators model the agents' decisions.

$$\begin{aligned} P_2 &= |x_1 e^{i\lambda_1}, y_1 e^{i\epsilon_1}, z_1 e^{i\delta_1}\rangle \langle x_1 e^{-i\lambda_1}, y_1 e^{-i\epsilon_1}, z_1 e^{-i\delta_1}| \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1^2 & x_1 y_1 e^{-i(\epsilon_1 - \lambda_1)} & x_1 z_1 e^{-i(\delta_1 - \lambda_1)} \\ x_1 y_1 e^{i(\epsilon_1 - \lambda_1)} & y_1^2 & y_1 z_1 e^{-i(\delta_1 - \epsilon_1)} \\ x_1 z_1 e^{i(\delta_1 - \lambda_1)} & y_1 z_1 e^{i(\delta_1 - \epsilon_1)} & z_1^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0.02 e^{-i24.67^\circ} & 0.01 e^{-i23.90^\circ} \\ 0.02 e^{i24.67^\circ} & 0.87 & 0.34 e^{-i48.57^\circ} \\ 0.01 e^{i23.90^\circ} & 0.34 e^{i48.57^\circ} & 0.20 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
P_4 &= |x_2 e^{i\lambda_2}, y_2 e^{i\epsilon_2}, z_2 e^{i\delta_2}\rangle \langle x_2 e^{-i\lambda_2}, y_2 e^{-i\epsilon_2}, z_2 e^{-i\delta_2}| \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} x_2^2 & x_2 y_2 e^{-i(\epsilon_2 - \lambda_2)} & x_2 z_2 e^{-i(\delta_2 - \lambda_2)} \\ x_2 y_2 e^{i(\epsilon_2 - \lambda_2)} & y_2^2 & y_2 z_2 e^{-i(\delta_2 - \epsilon_2)} \\ x_2 z_2 e^{i(\delta_2 - \lambda_2)} & y_2 z_2 e^{i(\delta_2 - \epsilon_2)} & z_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 0.06 & 0.01e^{-i13.85^\circ} & 0.24e^{-i19.89^\circ} \\ 0.01e^{i13.85^\circ} & 0 & 0.02e^{-i6.05^\circ} \\ 0.24e^{i19.89^\circ} & 0.02e^{i6.05^\circ} & 0.94 \end{pmatrix} \tag{68}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$P_1 = \mathbb{1} - P_2 + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -0.02e^{-i24.67^\circ} & -0.01e^{-i23.90^\circ} \\ -0.02e^{i24.67^\circ} & 0.13 & -0.34e^{-i48.57^\circ} \\ -0.01e^{i23.90^\circ} & -0.34e^{i48.57^\circ} & 0.87 \end{pmatrix} \tag{69}$$

and

$$P_3 = \mathbb{1} - P_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.94 & -0.01e^{-i13.85^\circ} & -0.24e^{-i19.89^\circ} \\ -0.01e^{i13.85^\circ} & 1 & -0.02e^{-i6.05^\circ} \\ -0.24e^{i19.89^\circ} & -0.02e^{i6.05^\circ} & 0.06 \end{pmatrix} \tag{70}$$

The observable associated with the preference between f_1 and f_2 is then represented by the self-adjoint operator (spectral decomposition) $\mathcal{O}_{12}$, while the observable associated with the preference between f_3 and f_4 is represented by the self-adjoint operator (spectral decomposition) $\mathcal{O}_{34}$, and further $[\mathcal{O}_{12}, \mathcal{O}_{34}] \neq 0$. More explicitly, if we set $o_1 = o_3 = 1$ and $o_2 = o_4 = -1$, we get the following explicit representations.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_{12} &= P_1 - P_2 = \mathbb{1} - 2P_2 \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -0.04e^{-i24.67^\circ} & -0.02e^{-i23.90^\circ} \\ -0.04e^{i24.67^\circ} & -0.74 & -0.68e^{-i48.57^\circ} \\ -0.02e^{i23.90^\circ} & -0.68e^{i48.57^\circ} & 0.6 \end{pmatrix} \tag{71}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_{34} &= P_3 - P_4 = \mathbb{1} - 2P_4 \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 0.88 & -0.02e^{-i13.85^\circ} & -0.48e^{-i19.89^\circ} \\ -0.02e^{i13.85^\circ} & 1 & -0.04e^{-i6.05^\circ} \\ -0.48e^{i19.89^\circ} & -0.04e^{i6.05^\circ} & -0.88 \end{pmatrix} \tag{72}
\end{aligned}$$

The above non-commutativity has a profound meaning. It indeed means that the conceptual landscape surrounding the agents' preference and influencing the decision process in the first bet is incompatible with the conceptual landscape surrounding the agents' preference and influencing the decision process in the second bet. This is exactly what one usually finds in quantum mechanics when dealing with incompatible observables.

Our quantum theoretic modeling of the Ellsberg paradox situation is thus completed. We however want to add some explanatory remarks concerning the novelty of our approach, as follows.

(i) We have incorporated the subjective preference of traditional economics approaches in the quantum state describing the conceptual Ellsberg entity. At variance with existing proposals, the subjective preference coded in the quantum state can be different for each one of the acts f_j , since it is not derived from any prefixed mathematical rule. Therefore, we can naturally explain a situation with f_1 preferred to f_2 and f_4 preferred to f_3 , without the need of assuming extra hypotheses.

(ii) In the present paper, we have detected genuine quantum aspects in the description of the Ellsberg paradox situation, namely, contextuality, superposition, and incompatibility. Further deepening and experimenting will most probably will reveal other quantum aspects, such as emergence. Hence the hypothesis

that quantum effects, of a conceptual nature, concretely drive decision-makers' behavior in uncertainty situations is warranted.

(iii) We have focused here on the Ellsberg paradox. But, our quantum theoretic modeling is sufficiently general to cope with various generalizations of the Ellsberg paradox, which are problematical in traditional economics approaches, such as the Machina paradox [16]. This opens the way toward the construction of a unified framework extending standard expected utility and modeling 'ambiguity laden' situations in economics and decision theory.

References

- [1] von Neumann, J., Morgenstern, O.: Theory of Games and Economic Behavior. Princeton University Press, Princeton (1944)
- [2] Savage, L.J.: The Foundations of Statistics. Wiley, New York (1954)
- [3] Ellsberg, D.: Risk, ambiguity, and the Savage axioms. *Quart. J. Econ.* **75**, 643–669 (1961)
- [4] Machina, M.J.: Risk, Ambiguity, and the Dark-dependence Axioms. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **99**, 385–392 (2009)
- [5] Knight, F.H.: Risk, Uncertainty and Profit. Houghton Mifflin, Boston (1921)
- [6] I. Gilboa, Expected utility with purely subjective non-additive probabilities, *J. Math. Econ.* **16**, 65–88 (1987)
- [7] Gilboa, I., Schmeidler, D.: Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior. *J. Math. Econ.* **18**, 141–153 (1989)
- [8] Maccheroni, F., Marinacci, M., Rustichini, A.: Dynamical variational preferences. *The Carlo Alberto Notebooks* **1**, pp. 37 (2006)
- [9] Klibanoff, P., Marinacci, M., Mukerji, S.: A smooth model of decision making under ambiguity. *Econometrica* **73**, 1849–1892 (2005)
- [10] Epstein, L.G.: A Definition of uncertainty aversion. *Rev. Econ. Stud.* **66**, 579–608 (1999)
- [11] Baillon, A., L'Haridon, O., Placido, L.: Ambiguity models and the Machina paradoxes. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **1547**, 1547–1560 (2011)
- [12] Aerts, D., Broekaert, J., Czachor, M., D'Hooghe, B.: The violation of expected utility hypothesis in the disjunction effect. A quantum-conceptual explanation of violations of expected utility in economics. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* vol. **7052**, 192–198. Springer, Berlin (2011)
- [13] Aerts, D., D'Hooghe, B., Sozzo, S.: A quantum cognition analysis of the Ellsberg paradox. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* vol. **7052**, 95–104. Springer, Berlin (2011)
- [14] Aerts, D., Sozzo, S.: Quantum Structure in Economics: The Ellsberg Paradox. In: D'Ariano, M., et al. (eds.) *Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations-6*, pp. 487–494. AIP, New York (2012)
- [15] Aerts, D., Sozzo, S.: Contextual Risk and Its Relevance in Economics; A Contextual Risk Model for the Ellsberg Paradox. *J. Eng. Sci. Tech. Rev.* **4**, 241-245; 246–250 (2012)

- [16] Aerts, D., Sozzo, S., Tapia, J.: A quantum model for the Ellsberg and Machina paradoxes. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* vol. **7620**, 48–59. Springer, Berlin (2012)
- [17] Bruza, P.D., Lawless, W., van Rijsbergen, C.J., Sofge, D., Editors: *Proceedings of the AAAI Spring Symposium on Quantum Interaction*, March 27–29. Stanford University, Stanford (2007)
- [18] Bruza, P.D., Lawless, W., van Rijsbergen, C.J., Sofge, D., Editors: *Quantum Interaction: Proceedings of the Second Quantum Interaction Symposium*. College Publications, London (2008)
- [19] Bruza, P.D., Sofge, D., Lawless, W., Van Rijsbergen, K., Klusch, M., Editors: *Proceedings of the Third Quantum Interaction Symposium*. *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence* vol. **5494**. Springer, Berlin (2009)
- [20] Aerts, D.: Quantum structure in cognition. *J. Math. Psychol.* **53**, 314–348 (2009)
- [21] Busemeyer, J.R., Lambert-Mogiliansky, A.: An exploration of type indeterminacy in strategic decision-making. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* vol. **5494**, 113–127. Springer, Berlin (2009)
- [22] Pothos, E.M., Busemeyer, J.R.: A quantum probability model explanation for violations of ‘rational’ decision theory. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B* **276**, 2171–2178 (2009)
- [23] Danilov, V.I., Lambert-Mogiliansky, A.: Expected utility theory under non-classical uncertainty. *Theory and Decision* **68**, 25–47 (2010)
- [24] Khrennikov, A.Y.: *Ubiquitous Quantum Structure*. Springer, Berlin (2010)
- [25] Song, D., Melucci, M., Frommholz, I., Zhang, P., Wang, L., Arafat, S., Editors: *Quantum Interaction*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* vol. **7052**. Springer, Berlin (2011)
- [26] Busemeyer, J.R., Pothos, E., Franco, R., Trueblood, J.S.: A quantum theoretical explanation for probability judgment ‘errors’. *Psychol. Rev.* **118**, 193–218 (2011)
- [27] Busemeyer, J.R., Bruza, P.D.: *Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2012)
- [28] Tversky, A., Kahneman, D.: Judgements of and by representativeness. In: Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., Tversky, A. (Eds.) *Judgement Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*, 84–98. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1982)
- [29] Tversky, A., Shafir, E.: The disjunction effect in choice under uncertainty. *Psychol. Sci.* **3**, 305–309 (1992)